## Application No. Applicant(s) 09/489,373 KOPLAR ET AL. Interview Summary Art Unit **Examiner** Dominic Saltarelli 2611 All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (3) Randy Canis (4) Chris Chupp (1) *Hai Tran*. (2) Dominic Saltarelli. Date of Interview: 25 April 2005 Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description: Brought two handheld devices for demonstration Claim(s) discussed: 76,81, 98, 131, 133, 138, 142, 143, 149, 150 Identification of prior art discussed: Nentrofsky Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: \_ (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet. Discussed current status of claims, potential limiting language, and further examination of claims in light of possible filing of an RCE.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required